



United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/706,408	11/03/2000	Mitsuru Takeyasu	80A 3002	7889
75	90 04/10/2003			
Koda and Androlia 2029 Century Park East Suite 3850			EXAMINER	
			WARD, JOHN A	
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3024				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2875	
			DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

[·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
•	_	09/706,408	TAKEYASU ET AL.
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit
		John A. Ward	2875
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 IN SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In six (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In six (7) period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period warre to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 J	anuary 2003	
2a) <u></u>	_	s action is non-final.	
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal matters, n	rosecution as to the merits is
Disnositi	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>l</i> ion of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.
-	Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are pending in the application.		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration	
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	in from consideration.	•
_	Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.		
_	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement	
	on Papers	cicolon requirement.	
9)∏ Т	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		•
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accept		niner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
11) 🗌 T	he proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)□ approved b)□ disappro	ved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in repl		
	he oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	miner.	
	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign _	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).
a)[_	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure se the attached detailed Office action for a list of	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	·
	knowledgment is made of a claim for domestic		
a)	☐ The translation of the foreign language provi	sional application has been rece	ived.
ttachment(s	·	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
?)	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informat Pa	PTO-413) Paper No(s) tent Application (PTO-152)
Patent and Trad O-326 (Rev.	A	n Summary	Part of Paper No. 6

Art Unit: 2875

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDermott (US 5,899,557) in view of McDermott (US 5,894,196).

Regarding claim 1, McDermott ('557) discloses a multi-source lighting device comprising of a plurality of light distributing LEDs S1-S6 mounted in a circular formation on a circuit board 9, figure 9 teaches how they are arrange radially on an horizontal circumference so that a wider divergence of each LED is horizontally than vertically (see figure 2 and 3), (column 8, lines 4-40).

Regarding claim 2, claim 2 of McDermott discloses a lens 32 provided with a diffusion part that diffuses light only in a horizontal direction.

McDermott regarding claims 3 discloses a lens 32, having a diffuses portion (claim 6), figure 1, 2, and 12, teaches how the LED lighting fixtures is comprise of a plurality of light distributing LEDs and are provided radially and on a horizontal circumference.

McDermott does not disclose elliptically light distributing LEDs.

Regarding claim 1, discloses an angled elliptical axial light device comprising of an elliptical light emitting diodes having an elliptical distribution (claim 1).

Art Unit: 2875

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the lighting device of McDermott with he elliptical axial lighting of McDermott in order to provide an lighting device to provide a plurality of LED elements to project a composite light beam with an elongated beam pattern using an optical system that optimizes the percentage of created light that contributes to the light beam as taught by McDermott (column 2, lines 48-52)

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDermott in view of in view of McDermott (US 5,894,196) and in view of Ryan, Jr. et al (US 6,244,727).

McDermott regarding claims 4-5 discloses all the limitations of the claims comprising of LEDs S1-S7, a lens 32, having a diffuses portion (claim 6), figure 1, 2, and 12, teaches how the LED lighting fixtures is comprise of a plurality of elliptically light distributing LEDs and are provided radially and on a horizontal circumference. Figure 12 show that the lighting fixture can be stacked for an increase of illumination.

McDermott does not disclose elliptically light distributing LEDs.

Regarding claim 4, discloses an angled elliptical axial light device comprising of an elliptical light emitting diodes having an elliptical distribution (claim 1).

McDermott does not disclose that a screw that runs through the bosses of the lighting fixture fastens the stack units or the lens being unit-type lens.

Art Unit: 2875

It is desired to provide a means to attach a plurality of circuit boards together in a vertical array in order to provide an increased amount of light emitting from the lighting device, and a means to mount the circuit boards.

Regarding claim 6, Ryan, Jr. et al ('727) discloses an optic lens cell and illuminated signage having a cell array comprising of a plurality of elliptically distributing LEDs 12 (column 6, lines 1-10) mounted on a printed circuit board in a horizontal position adjacent to a unit-type lens 18 for illuminating each light emitting diode in a horizontal direction, and a screw 19 to hold the lens 18 in place to the printed circuit board.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the lighting device of McDermott with he elliptical axial lighting of McDermott and the optic lens cell of Ryan, Jr. et al in order to provide an lighting device to provide a plurality of LED elements to project a composite light beam with an elongated beam pattern using an optical system that optimizes the percentage of created light that contributes to the light beam as taught by McDermott (column 2, lines 48-52).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dermott (US 5,894,196)

Regarding claim 7, McDermott discloses the claimed invention including an elliptically distributed light emitting diode, except for the LED's having a divergence angle of 120-150 degrees. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 2875

the time the invention was made to provide the LED's having a horizontal divergence of an angle from 120-150 degrees, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. McDermott (US 5,898,267) also discloses elliptically distributed LED.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John A. Ward whose telephone number is 703-305-5157. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on 703-305-4939. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2875

Page 6

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0596.

JAW

April 2, 2003

John A: Ward

Patent Examiner AU 2875